

some legislative language on how we might demand greater accountability for seeing that equal opportunity for education is going to be met at the State as well as the local and national levels.

I don't expect anything dramatic to be adopted in this Chamber on this particular bill. But it is a debate we ought to start. CHAKA FATTAH, a very effective Member of Congress from the city of Philadelphia, is a good friend of mine. CHAKA FATTAH wrote language which specifically addresses this issue. In fact, he offered it in the U.S. House of Representatives in the previous Congress and received close to 200 votes in the other Chamber. It is a rather complicated proposal but one which goes to the heart of this issue, again without insisting on any particular formulation but saying the States have to do a better job in working to see to it that equal opportunity in education is going to be available to all students and be held to some degree of accountability on this issue.

I commend Congressman FATTAH for offering that amendment and for provoking that debate. He sent me the language on that. I am going to submit it for the consideration of my colleagues, perhaps with some variation, over the next couple of weeks.

Again, I thank the membership for their hard work, and especially of Senator KENNEDY and Senator JEFFORDS, the ranking member and chair of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee on which I have the pleasure of sitting. I know my colleague from New Jersey has a strong desire to join at some point. We hope he will be there with us. It is an exciting committee. They have done a good job.

I commend Senator DASCHLE, the Democratic leader, and Senator LOTT as well, for moving this debate along.

This has been a pretty good first week—better than I ever thought it would when we started the week. We see a lot more has to be considered. I will have amendments to offer with Senator SHELBY of Alabama and Senator DOMENICI of New Mexico. We will be proposing those amendments at the appropriate time, which we hope our colleagues will support.

I look forward to those debates and discussions, and other amendments our colleagues will be offering.

I think we have started out on a pretty good foot. We have not answered all of the questions. But I think we are going to marry resources and reforms in a package that most of us are going to be able to support.

AMENDMENT NO. 375 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, I send a modification to the desk of an amendment he has offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 375) to amendment No. 358, as modified, is as follows: (Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding, and authorize appropriations for, title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 902. SENSE OF THE SENATE; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should appropriate \$3,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 to carry out part A title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and thereby—

(1) provide that schools, local educational agencies, and States have the resources they need to put a highly qualified teacher in every classroom in each school in which 50 percent or more of the children are from low income families, over the next 4 years;

(2) provide 125,000 new teachers with mentors and year-long supervised internships; and

(3) provide high quality pedagogical training for every teacher in every school.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out title II Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—

(1) \$3,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(2) \$4,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(3) \$4,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(4) \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(5) \$5,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

(6) \$6,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, is morning business the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, with a 10-minute limitation.

Mr. DODD. I gather our colleague and friend from West Virginia may be here shortly, as he is inclined to do on Fridays for periods of enlightenment. I encourage Members to listen carefully to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia. He always has the most interesting discussions on history and poetry and important national holidays and days of recognition. It is worthy of the Senate's attention for those who may be following the debate through the channels of public communication.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for as long as is necessary, and it will not be all that long, but long enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FUTURE COURSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, earlier this week, Vice President CHENEY gave us a brief glimpse of the administration's soon-to-be-released energy plan that suggests that we need to take action to avert an impending energy crisis. He suggested that the plan will push for increasing fuel supplies from domestic sources. Still, the Vice President did not explain how domestic climate change programs will be reflected in the energy plan, nor did he discuss press reports that the administration is developing a plan to deal with the international aspects of climate change.

I would like to focus on the latter, and discuss recent decisions by the administration regarding the international negotiations. Climate change cannot be discussed in complete isolation from the soon-to-be released energy plan, since the issue of climate change must be addressed both domestically and internationally.

I wish to note, at the outset, that I applaud the administration's support for clean coal technologies and the administration's recognition that coal is one of our country's most important sources of energy. I recognize and strongly support this policy by the executive branch. A bill I have introduced this session, S. 60, the National Electricity and Environmental Technology Act, addresses the challenges faced by coal, and I would welcome the administration's active support to utilize coal in a cleaner, more efficient way.

I also believe, however, that it would be a mistake to focus too heavily just on increasing fuel supplies from domestic sources. If that is where the administration is headed, it is not on exactly the right path. In order to solve the challenge of climate change, we must develop new domestic sources such as coal, using clean coal technologies, while also engaging in bold initiatives to develop new technologies in the area of energy conservation, energy efficiency, and renewable energy.

I am concerned, based upon preliminary reports, that the administration's plan may not reflect such a balanced and farsighted perspective. Let me begin by noting the obvious—the primary, manmade cause of global warming is the burning of the very fossil fuels that power virtually the entire world.

Here is part of the power just above us as we look up to the ceiling of the

Senate Chamber and see these lights. What is required, then, is the equivalent of an industrial revolution. We must develop new and cleaner technologies to burn fossil fuels as well as new methods to capture and sequester greenhouse gases, and we must develop renewable technology that is practical and cost-effective. Rarely has mankind been confronted with such a challenge—a challenge to improve how we power our economy. This is the greatest nation in the world when the issue is one of applying our engineering talents to push beyond the next incremental improvement, and, instead, visualize and then achieve major leaps forward. We can do this, if only we apply ourselves. The scale and the scope of the problem are enormous, as is the leadership that will be required by the current administration, and, for that matter, the next dozen administrations, if we are to confront and overcome this awesome challenge in our children's time and in our grandchildren's lifetime.

But this takes visionary leadership. It would take extraordinary leadership. We need more than just small, incremental increases in our domestic oil supplies or in our existing research and development programs. This is an approach which only pays lip service to the challenge that we face. It is a huge challenge. I hope that the administration's plan will take a broader view.

We must also recognize that the European Union, China, and other developing nations are quick to point the finger at us, at the world's largest contributor to global warming. We must demonstrate our resolve, and begin to get our own house in order by launching such a research and development effort, as well as continuing and expanding our current efforts to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

However, it should also be noted that China will soon surpass us as the largest emitter of greenhouse gases. The Chinese Government must stop blocking all forward movement on the question of developing country participation. The developing world is poorly served by the current level of Chinese intransigence. The poorest nations in the developing world—which will be those that are hardest hit by global warming during this century—must demand leadership from within their own ranks, and especially from China. The Chinese leadership must join us in honestly discussing solutions to the problem of climate change. The United States can develop and provide the technological breakthroughs that can be deployed by all nations, as we move forward together to solve this common, global problem.

However, I want to emphatically warn that new technologies and voluntary approaches will not by themselves solve this problem. We must also actively negotiate and ratify inter-

national agreements that include binding commitments for all of the largest emitters of greenhouse gases, if we are to have any hope of solving one of the world's—one of humanity's—greatest challenges.

This concern takes me back to the Senate's actions just 4 years ago. During the Senate floor debate over Senate Resolution 98 in July 1997, I expressed two fundamental beliefs that have guided my approach on the issue of climate change. First, while some scientific uncertainties remain, I believe that there is significant, mounting evidence that mankind is altering the world's climate. Second, the voluntary approach of the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, commonly known as the Rio Convention, has failed, as almost all of the nations of the world, including the United States, have been unable to meet their obligations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. With those points in mind, we must ask what needs to be done in a binding fashion to begin to address this global issue—the preeminent environmental challenge of our time.

On July 25, 1997, the Senate passed, by a vote of 95–0, S. Res. 98 which stated that, first, developing nations, especially the largest emitters, must agree to binding emission reduction commitments at the same time as industrialized nations and, second, any international climate change agreement must not result in serious harm to the U.S. economy. That resolution served as guidance to U.S. negotiators as they prepared to hammer out the details of the Kyoto Protocol.

Senator HAGEL and I were the prime cosponsors of that resolution.

The adoption of that resolution was perhaps, a dose of reality—laying out, in advance of the completion of the Kyoto negotiations or the anticipated submission of a climate change treaty to the Senate, just what an administration—any administration—would need to win the Senate's advice and consent. Contrary to statements made by some in this administration, the Senate has never voted on the Kyoto Protocol, although the protocol, in its current form, does not meet the requirements of S. Res. 98.

Since that vote in July 1997, international climate change negotiations have covered a wide range of topics in an attempt to craft a balanced treaty. While there have been some important gains and there have been some unfortunate setbacks from the U.S. perspective, I am concerned that, in the Bush administration's zeal to reject Kyoto for its failure to comply with S. Res. 98, the baby is being thrown out with the bath water through a complete abandonment of the negotiating process. Such an abandonment would be very costly to U.S. leadership and credibility and could force the inter-

national community to go back to “square one” on certain critical issues such as carbon sequestration and market-based mechanisms—areas which I believe are critical to any future binding climate change treaty.

Still, an examination even of Kyoto's drawbacks can provide the basis for forward movement by the Bush administration.

Let me say that again. An examination, even of Kyoto's drawbacks, can provide the basis for forward movement by the Bush administration.

For example, U.S. negotiators should go back to the negotiating table with proposals that could be achieved internationally. In my opinion, an effective and binding international agreement must include several elements. First, the initial binding emission reduction targets and caps should be economically and environmentally achievable. Such an international agreement should specify increments by which the initial reduction could be ratcheted downward and made more stringent over time. This architecture could provide a realistic and obtainable target, and it would give U.S. industry more time to prepare to meet such requirements. Additionally, the inclusion of incremental reductions would encourage the development of a range of cleaner, more efficient technologies to meet the long-term goal, namely, the stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere. Most important, these steps would give the United States a clearer path toward the goal of dealing seriously with a serious and growing problem.

Recently, we have heard talk by the Bush administration to the effect that the United States should promote voluntary initiatives to meet our international treaty commitments. Well, that sounds good, but it will not work. I note that, in 1993, the former administration undertook an extensive assessment to formulate the U.S. Climate Change Action Plan, which subsequently developed a wide range of voluntary programs and technology strategies to help the United States reduce domestic emissions to 1990 levels. While these remain laudable and important programs, they have not put us on a path toward significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In fact, rather than accomplishing that goal, by the late 1990s, U.S. emissions were at least 11 percent above those 1990 levels. Clearly then, the next global climate change treaty will have to include binding emission limits by industrialized nations, as well as developing nations, specifically the biggest emitters in the developing world. I am talking about China, India, Mexico, Brazil, and others.

Additionally, as I explained at the time we were debating S. Res. 98, the initial commitment by developing countries could be modest, with the

agreement specifying a more rigorous approach to growth and emissions over time. Recent press reports indicate that China, the big emitter, exceeding the emissions of the United States very soon, has already made progress in reducing the growth of its greenhouse gas emissions. That is good news. That is encouraging. A future binding climate change agreement could recognize these efforts and provide market-based mechanisms by which China could obtain technological assistance to expand upon its efforts over time.

An international treaty with binding commitments can and should provide for the continued growth of the world's developing nations. The economic growth of Mexico or China, for example, need not be choked off by unrealistically stringent, inflexible emission reduction targets. The initial commitment could be relatively modest, pacing upwards depending upon various factors, with a specific goal to be achieved within a fixed time period. If properly designed, a binding international treaty can accommodate economic growth and environmental improvement in the developing world. This approach provides the means by which China and other key developing nations can grow in a more efficient, environmentally sound manner while also making commitments to reduce their fair share of this global climate change burden.

Using this approach, the Bush administration has a historic opportunity to shape, rather than cripple, the international climate change debate by negotiating an agreement that includes all of the largest emitters of greenhouse gases on a global basis.

It is a huge task no doubt, but it is a huge problem, and it confronts the world, not just he occidental but also the oriental—not just the West but also the East. Such an agreement must also include market mechanisms that are unencumbered by layers of bureaucracy; strong provisions for domestic and international sinks, sequestration, and projects that prevent deforestation; and tough enforcement and compliance requirements.

But any such agreement must also be met by an honest effort on America's domestic front. I am, therefore, very concerned that the President's overall budget does not adequately provide the level of funding necessary to support programs and policies that would address U.S. energy and climate change challenges. So I urge the Bush Administration to include all relevant policy aspects in the energy needs assessment currently under review and to examine the total costs—both economic and environmental—in any national energy strategy. I hope the President will work with Congress on these critical issues to develop a constructive, long-term negotiating path for the future. America leads the world in so many

important areas—addressing our global climate change challenges should be front and center.

TRADE POLICY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have serious concerns about certain trade policy issues that the Bush administration inherited from its predecessor, but which remain unresolved. I refer to the steel crisis, the failure to formulate a coherent trade policy with respect to China, and the failure to recognize that “fast-track” trade negotiating authority represents both an unwarranted diminution of the Constitutional authority of Congress and an invitation to our trade partners to accelerate their attack on the framework of fair trade.

As I have long maintained, U.S. trade policy cannot be complacent as America's manufacturing plants are moved to low-wage countries, a phenomenon that makes it increasingly difficult for American employers to stay competitive and, at the same time, pay good wages and provide good benefits to their workers. While American workers do benefit from lower prices for imported products, too many have been made worse off, on balance, by globalization. As the columnist Michael Kelly recently pointed out, “What the unionists know is that globalization ultimately depends on driving manufacturing jobs out of the country in which they live.”

Indeed, in many historically high-wage and efficient industries, the inevitable result of complacent trade policy is bankruptcy. The inevitable result of complacent trade policy is bankruptcy. A case in point is the U.S. steel industry. The steel crisis—which is the direct result of an unprecedented surge in imports, particularly dumped and subsidized imports—began in late 1997 and continues to this day. The surge in imports has already led 18 American steel companies—18 companies—to declare bankruptcy. Hear them at the other end of the avenue. Over the past year alone, an estimated 5,000 U.S. steelworkers have lost their jobs.

A great sage once said, “Reflect upon three things and you will not come to sin: Know from where you came, and to where you are going, and before whom you are destined to give an accounting.” Let's reflect again on those three things: Know from where you came, and to where you are going, and before whom you are destined to give an accounting. So, let me bring this issue a little closer to home, my home, that is. In 1996, Weirton Steel Corporation, of Weirton, West Virginia, in the very tip of the northern panhandle the eighth largest integrated steel producer in the United States, employed 5,375 of the most skilled workers and managers in the world, using the most up-to-date production technology. That was down

from a few years ago. What is it today? Today, in 2001, Weirton employs only 4,111 workers and managers, a loss of over 25 percent from 1996. Weirton just reported that its first quarter sales this year were down 24 percent from last year and that it lost \$75.3 million in the first quarter. Continuation of the status quo in the steel market will not mean continuation of the status quo for Weirton Steel, for it cannot stay in business over an extended period of time in the face of such losses.

Now, by Ohio Valley steel industry standards, Weirton is the lucky one even with such losses. Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp., the ninth largest U.S. integrated steel producer, was forced last year to declare a Chapter 11 bankruptcy in order to avoid being picked apart by its creditors. I hope that it will soon emerge from bankruptcy with the help of a federally guaranteed loan.

I could talk about the need for a section 201 investigation of “serious injury” to the American steel industry. Such an investigation is necessary, and it is necessary now—the administration should not tie its decision on a 201 investigation to any other trade policy initiative. But, I will save that discussion for another day. Rather, I wish to point out that the administration is sending a damaging signal on its approach to the steel crisis by proposing to rescind \$10 million from the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program.

Because the demands on that program will—in all likelihood—continue to increase, the proposed reduction in funding represents an unacceptable risk of harm to an industry that is vital both to our national defense and the way of life of communities across this Nation.

The emergency guarantee program was made necessary because of the reaction of the financial community to the onset of the steel crisis. With no assurance that the injurious surge in steel imports would abate in the near future, financial institutions were—for the most part—unwilling to restructure steel producers' debts. Thus, Congress acted to provide incentives for private-sector loans to the steel industry. The new program was signed into law on August 17, 1999, and was designed to give qualified U.S. steel producers access to a \$1 billion revolving guaranteed loan fund.

I say, parenthetically, that I was the author of that legislation.

Now is simply the wrong time to be considering rescissions from the emergency guarantee program. There are many steel companies in Chapter 11 bankruptcy, and several of them will undoubtedly request these federally guaranteed loans as a key element in their restructuring programs.

The steel crisis takes us right into the issue of our trade policy toward China. Whatever else one might say